



## Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on  
10-5-05 with the United States Postal Service  
with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed  
to:

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Typed or Printed name of person signing this certificate:  
Mary Curtin

Signature: Mary Curtin

PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:  
**Hagopian et al.**

Serial No.: 10/710,805

Filed: August 4, 2004

For: **PRODUCT COMPRISING A THIN-FILMED  
RADIATION-CURED COATING ON A THREE-  
DIMENSIONAL SUBSTRATE**

) Examiner: Howard E. Abramowitz  
)  
) Art Unit: 1762  
)  
) CUSTOMER NO. 24024  
)  
) Confirmation No.: 4804  
)  
) Attorney Docket No.: 27475/06963  
)

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

### RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

#### INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

This document responds to the Office Action mailed on July 5, 2005 (the "Office Action"). Claims 1-56 are now pending in this application. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 19, 27, 28 and 29 as being purportedly indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2. In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected claims 1-5, 7, 12-17, 46, 47 and 51-56 on the grounds that they are purportedly anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 6,231,931 ("Blazey '931"). The Examiner further rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 53 and 56 as being purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,268,022 ("Schlegel '022"). The Examiner further rejected claims 1-5, 7-13, 18, 20-22, 28, 32-35, 39-44, 46, 47, 49 and 51-56 as being purportedly

anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,989,638 (“Nielsen ‘638”). The Examiner further rejected claims 1, 4-7, 12, 13, 32-35, 52, 53 and 56 as being purportedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0183166 (U.S. Patent No. 6,746,535 (“Hasenour ‘535”)). The Examiner further rejected several dependent claims as described in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Blazey ‘931 or Nielsen ‘638 taken in view of other prior art references. The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s rejections for the reasons more fully set forth below.